

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

SPRINT
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK KS 66251-2100

COPY MAILED

OCT 0 2 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Kevin Packingham et al. :

Application No. 09/964,099
Filed: September 26, 2001
Attorney Docket No. 1732

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR CONSOLIDATED MESSAGE

NOTIFICATION IN A VOICE COMMAND

PLATFORM

DECISION ON PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. \$1.181

This is a decision on the petition filed on August 9, 2004, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181, requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

The Office regrets the period of delay in issuing this decision.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply within the meaning of 37 C.F.R \$1.113 in a timely manner to the final Office action mailed October 24, 2003, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R \$1.136(a) were obtained, and no responses were received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on January 25, 2004.

With the present petition, Petitioner has alleged that the mailing was not received. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that

the Office communication was not received. In addition, a copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement¹.

Petitioner has met the requirements of <u>Delgar v. Schuyler</u>, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), in that he has asserted that the Office communication was not received, that he has searched both the file jacket and the docket record, and he has included a copy of the latter.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, as set forth on petition, it is concluded that Petitioner has met his burden of establishing that the mailing was not received.

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a) is **GRANTED**. The holding of abandonment is **WITHDRAWN**.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will re-mail the communication of October 24, 2003, and will set a new period for response.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225². All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

It is noted that the address listed on the petition differs from the address of record. The application file does not indicate a change of correspondence address has been filed in this case, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. If petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the change of correspondence address must be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision will be mailed to petitioner. However, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary. Petitioner will not receive future correspondence related to this application unless Change of Correspondence Address, Patent Form (PTO/SB/122) is submitted for the above-identified application. For petitioner's convenience, a blank

¹ See MPEP 711.03(c).

² Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. §1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).

Application No. 09/964,099 Decision on Petition

Change of Correspondence Address, Patent Form (PTO/SB/122), may be found at http://www.uspto.gov/web/forms/sb0122.pdf.

Paul Shanoski

Senior Attorney

Office of Petitions

United States Patent and Trademark Office

cc: McDonnell Boehnen
 Hulbert & Berghoff
 300 South Wacker Drive
 Chicago, IL 60606